

6-1-1995

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet June 1995

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet June 1995" (1995). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. Paper 196.

<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/196>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

LD4349
A142
F25

THE PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE



TO: Senators and *Ex-officio* Members to the Senate
FROM: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **June 5, 1995**, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

PLEASE RESERVE THE FULL TWO-HOURS ON YOUR CALENDARS FOR THIS MEETING OF THE SENATE IN ORDER TO CONDUCT YEAR-END BUSINESS AND ELECTIONS. IF YOU HAVE A FINAL EXAM, PLEASE ARRANGE FOR YOUR ALTERNATE TO SUBSTITUTE DURING YOUR ABSENCE.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 1, 1995 Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
 - 1. Announcements
 - 2. President's Report
 - 3. Provost's Report

MAY 24 1995

***** ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE FOR 1995-96 *****

- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

*****ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO-TEM FOR 1995-96 *****

- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - OSU Faculty Senate Resolutions, Steering Committee Endorsement - Hales
 - Annual Report, Intercollegiate Athletic Board(see May 1, 1995 Senate Agenda) - Brenner
 - 1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - Burns
 - 2. Annual Report Teacher Education Committee - E. Young
 - 3. Annual Report, Advisory Council - B. Oshika
 - 4. Annual Report, Committee on Committees - A. Johnson
 - 5. Semi Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee - S. Bleiler
 - 6. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council - B. Oshika
 - 7. School of Education P&T Guidelines, Advisory Council & University Planning Council - Oshika

***** ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE FOR 1995-96 *****

- F. Unfinished Business
 - 1. Constitutional Amendment (Ex Officio Membership of the Faculty) - Oshika for Advisory Council
 - 2. Four-credit Course System Recommendation, University Planning Council - Oshika
 - 3. Four-credit Course System Recommendation, Curriculum Committee - Holloway
 - 4. Four-credit Course System Recommendation, Academic Requirements Committee - Rosengrant

G. New Business

H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the May 1, 1995 Senate Meeting
- E Steering Committee Endorsement of OSU Faculty Senate Resolutions
- E2 Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee
- E3 Annual Report, Advisory Council
- E4 Annual Report, Committee on Committees
- E5 Semi Annual Report, Faculty Development Committee
- E6 Quarterly Report, University Planning Council

Secretary to the Faculty
341 Cramer Hall (503)725-4416 IN:sarah@po.pdx.edu

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 1, 1995
Presiding Officer: Loyde Hales
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Abrams, Barton, Becker, Bluestone, Bowlden, Bowman, Bulman, Cooper, DeCarrico, Falco, Feeney, Fisher, Fosque, Franks, Goldman, Gray, Hales, A. Johnson, Jolin(1st half), Kocaoglu, Kosokoff, Lall, Fokine, Liebman, Limbaugh, Maynard, Miller, Ogle, Robertson, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Watanabe, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Forbes for Bodegom, Tracy for Jolin(2nd half), Wallis for McBride, Wineberg for Seltzer, Forbes for Tinnin

Members Absent: Brenner, Etesami, Greco, D. Johnson, Kenny, Krug, Lendaris, Manning, Novy, Raedels, Rhee, Watne, Weikel.

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Holloway, Davidson, Desrochers, Diman, K. Harris, Koch, Oshika(1st half), Ramaley, Mercer for Rosengrant, Toulan, Vieira, Ward.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:14 p.m. The Faculty Senate Minutes of April 3 and 17, 1995, were approved with one correction: D. Kocaoglu was noted as present 3 April.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. Announcements

Two items have been added to the agenda:

E. 4. Report of the University HIV Committee.

G. 3. Amendment to the Constitution, Art. V. Sec. 1. 1. (Ex Officio Membership of the Faculty).

2. President's Report

RAMALEY stated today's Oregonian had an excellent front page report on the condition of Oregon higher education which featured Leslie McBride, PHE, and included her photograph.

There will be a site visit on 9-11 May by representatives from the Big Sky Conference to evaluate our eligibility. They will issue a report in late May, and we will be notified by the end of June if we will be invited to join the Big Sky Conference.

A search committee has been appointed to conduct a national search for Athletic Director, to be chaired by Steven Brenner. A list of the committee membership will be circulated.

Budget deliberations are still in progress. We need to continue the pressure on our legislative leadership to put as much back as possible into the 1995-97 higher education budget. To date, the legislature has restored \$13. million of the 14% cut proposed in the Governor's budget for specific programs such as Veterinary Medicine, primarily at OSU and UO. Three weeks ago, Assoc. of Oregon Industries(AOI) came out strongly in support of the Chancellor's position that budget cuts exceeding 5% over our current operating budgets would severely impact programs. You are urged to contact your legislator. The PSU Alumni Advocates have produced an excellent short fact sheet which is available in the Alumni Office.

The OPEU strike is expected to begin May 8, 1995. Our responsibilities are to be respectful of our co-colleagues, express how we feel about the issues of the strike only on our personal time, and perform our regular duties. A letter to non-OPEU employees detailing these responsibilities will be forthcoming.

TALBOTT asked for an interpretation of OPEU's recent request that faculty not cross picket lines or teach classes across lines. RAMALEY stated that Vice President Desrocher's office was the best source of interpretation. As long as you meet your responsibilities as faculty and your students meet theirs' as students, it is your choice how you behave.

LALL asked for the names of the Big Sky evaluation team. RAMALEY stated the exact list is available from OAA.

3. Provost's Report

The Provost, Vice Provost, and Vice President were out of town.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

A. JOHNSON asked for a clarification on the "Pappas Report" (Consultant's Report on Improving Student Services) progress. Ray Johnson, Special Asst. to the Provost, stated that timelines for comment have been extended. One recommendation of the draft report was that the new Vice Provost for Student Affairs comment, and the Provost has made provision for that to happen. After that period, a final report will be issued.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Spring Term Registration Report . There was no report.

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

Scott Burns, IFS Senator, summarized the report of the IFS Meeting (attached).

BECKER asked Burns to elaborate on his remark that Ways & Means legislators still need educating about productivity. Burns cited the example of C. Oakley, whose comments indicated her impression that full time faculty work 15 hours per week.

2. Annual Report, Intercollegiate Athletic Board. In the absence of committee representation, the report was tabled until the June Senate meeting.

3. Annual Report, Budget Committee. LALL, Chair, presented the report (E3). OGLE asked for a clarification on hearings cited in the report. RAMALEY stated the regular Deans-level hearings for 1995-97 will take place. There are no hearings to accommodate budget reduction planned at this time.

4. University HIV Committee Report

Joan Strouse, Chair, read the following statement:

"As the Chair of PSU's HIV committee I am here to talk to you about your rights and responsibilities of confidentiality as supervisors, co-workers, students, and colleagues of people who may feel obliged to come to you because of your position to discuss their HIV status. It is not your right to, in any way, spread this type of highly confidential information to anyone. A persons' individual right to privcy is protected according to the Supreme Court under the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 9th Amendments. Another's HIV or AIDs status is not your story to tell. Unbelievably, it seems that some people at PSU have violated the privacy of others. We all have both a moral and legal obligation to honor a persons' request for confidentiality.

As Arthur Ashe tells us in his book about the media's outing of his AIDS status, 'The quality of one's life changes irrevocably when AIDS becomes public. Reason and rational thought are too often waived out of fear, caution or just plain ignorance.' He goes on to explain that after another declares your HIV status for you, one is left trying to manage both one's illness and trying to deal with other people's reactions or dismissals of you.

If you have questions or concerns about appropriate responses or behaviors in these types of situations, please contact members of the HIV Committee: Joan Strouse (ED), Dawn Graff-Haight (PHE), Mary Kinnick (ED), Leonard Simpson (BIO), Norm Wyers (SSW), Chuck Cooper (FAC), Ruth Fay (LIB), Sandra Franz (HS), Val LeGault (BO-FIS), Janis Nichols (PR), Gay Monteverde (Mult. Co. Health Div.), Claudia Webster (Oreg. Health Div.), Kim Lange (student), Doug Styles (student)."

WINEBERG suggested this message be distributed campus-wide. RAMALEY recommended publishing it in PSU Currently.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Four-credit Course System, Academic Requirements Committee

A. JOHNSON/BOWLDEN moved the Senate approve the ARC recommendation from the April Senate Meeting (F1) for the 4-credit Conversion and General Education Requirement:

CURRENT REQUIREMENT

1. In each of the academic distribution areas the total credits earned in the two departments must be a minimum of 18 credits. Distribution must include a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 in each of the two departments.
2. A total of 18 upper-division credits must be earned in the academic distribution areas with no more than 12 credits from any one department.
3. All bachelor degree students required to successfully complete two courses (six credits) of diversity coursework...
4. Maximum number of correspondence credit: 60.

Maximum number of Pass credits that may be counted for graduation: 45

Maximum number of Cooperative Education credits that may be applied towards degree requirements: 12

Residence credit: 45 (excluding credit by examination) of the final 60 or 165 of the total credits presented. *Restriction:* at least 25 of the last 45 credits must be taken for differentiated grades.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Recommend change from 18 credits to 16 credits in each of the distribution areas, and to 4 minimum and 12 maximum credits.
2. Recommend change from 18 credits to 16 credits. No change to 12 credit maximum.
3. Recommend change in language to read "two courses (minimum of six credits)"
4. No change recommended.

No change recommended.

No change recommended.

No change recommended.

Robert Mercer reported for Rosengrant, Chair. FOSQUE asked what would be the procedure for evaluating credits in two departments for departments continuing to offer three-credit courses. A. JOHNSON noted that the recommendation is for 4 credits minimum, in one department and 12 credits maximum, in another. WINEBERG asked why the committee recommended only four credits, the equivalent of one course, for the second department. MERCER stated the committee and others they consulted felt it provided more of an opportunity to explore other disciplines.

BULMAN asked when this recommendation would become effective. MERCER stated it is intended to take effect Fall 1996. BULMAN asked what would happen if few departments changed to four credit courses. WETZEL stated that more than one-half of all courses in the university are already slated to change to four credits. SVOBODA stated that unless a shortened approval process is developed, his school and department won't make a conversion deadline effective Fall 1996. He asked if other departments were further ahead than his school. WETZEL stated CLAS has a June 15, 1995, deadline for four-credit course proposals to be submitted to the college Curriculum Committee, in order to forward them to University Curriculum Committee by October 1995. OAA has made no provision to streamline the process to date. A. JOHNSON suggested that, given the dialogue in progress perhaps the other two committees reporting address some of these concerns.

MAYNARD/WINEBERG moved to table the motion until recommendations are forwarded from Curriculum Committee and University Planning Council.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Four-credit Course System Interim Report, University Planning Council

LIMBAUGH, reporting for Oshika, Chair, stated the committee is meeting weekly on the conversion issues. Our major activity is working with Facilities on the development of a scheduling database, which involves setting attributes for classrooms. The other is working with Curriculum Committee on development of a checklist of guidelines for the conversion. The recommendations will be forwarded at the June Senate meeting.

3. Four-credit Course System Interim Report, Curriculum Committee

HOLLOWAY, Chair, reported the committee is meeting every Wednesday at 8:00 a.m., and Holloway is meeting with UPC. The committee agrees that time is running out, and the objective is to have a preliminary recommendation for departments after its meeting this Wednesday. The committee has been frustrated

in its efforts to accelerate the approval process. A problem is emerging regarding courses with graduate numbers; the Graduate Council Chair has been contacted. Overall, departments should not increase credits; programs must consider reducing the number of courses offered to make the conversion. OAA does not appear to be planning to modify its forms, in spite of the obvious need for streamlining proposals. School committees, however, have developed "short" forms. Curriculum Committee recommend that departments use the existing course change proposal forms. They are proposing to OAA a "ganging" strategy, to put several courses on one form.

A. JOHNSON asked what is the objection to streamlining the process for courses which have no change except numbers of credits. HOLLOWAY stated that there are more qualitative changes than might be expected. D.JOHNSON suggested separating program change procedures from course change procedures to streamline the process. HOLLOWAY stated the line between them is not necessarily clear. LIEBMAN suggested provision be made to accomplish the change "on disk" as CLAS had done. HOLLOWAY counseled departments to continue their conversions, and use the old style forms for now.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Environmental Science Program Proposal

A. JOHNSON/_____ moved the Senate approve the Environmental Science Program(G1).

COOPER asked in what departments the program would reside. HOLLOWAY stated it is an interdisciplinary program and referred the question to a program representative, who stated it would be housed in the currently-named Office of Environmental Programs. A.JOHNSON indicated the three faculty members in attendance from the program. HOLLOWAY stated the Curriculum Committee is still reviewing the course descriptions, and will recommend final approval of these at a later date. KOSOKOFF stated the courses have passed CLAS Curriculum Committee. OGLE asked what the minimum credits of 164 or 165 or 180 were for. They reflect the breadth determined by specific minors in the total program. COOPER asked if the program proposal reflects the new General Education requirement, how will "old" students graduate under this set of hours. HOLLOWAY stated some of the minor requirements could be met concurrently with the old General Education requirement.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Community Development Program Proposal

LIEBMAN/WOLLNER moved the Senate approve the Community Development Program(G2).

WINEBERG asked where the program would be housed for advising purposes, and if the new Urban Studies courses had been approved. HOLLOWAY yielded to N. Chapman, UPA, who replied that courses have been approved and administration and advising will take place in USP.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Constitutional Amendment, Article V, Sec. 1, 1) (Ex-officio Membership)

(Text to be added is underlined.)

"Article V. Faculty Senate.

Section 1. Membership

1) Ex-officio Members

a) The President, the Provost, all Vice Presidents; all Deans; the Director of the Library; all Executive Directors; all Vice Provosts; all Assistants to the President; all Assistants to the Provost; all Assistants to the Vice President; the Secretary to the Faculty; a representative of the retired faculty association; and the Student Body President of the Associated Students of Portland State University shall serve as ex-officio members of the Senate. Ex-officio members shall have full rights of discussion and making of motions but shall not have the right to vote. These Ex-officio members are not eligible to become elected members.

b) The chairperson of constitutional committees shall serve as ex-officio members if they are not serving as elected members."

HALES stated this is proposed as a housekeeping amendment to reflect administrative changes and the broadened base of "faculty." WINEBERG asked why chairs of administrative committees are not included in Art.V. 1.1.b. ANDREWS-COLLIER stated administrative committee rosters are listed in the *Faculty Governance Guide* as a courtesy to facilitate overall university governance. HOLLOWAY stated the faculty has no constitutional control over administrative committees. There was no further discussion.

HALES noted the Secretary to the Faculty will direct G3(above) to the Advisory Council for review, to be returned to the Senate in June.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m. and all present were invited for refreshments at "K" House.

Portland State University

P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751

MEMORANDUM

The following resolutions of the Oregon State University Faculty Senate were endorsed by the Steering Committee of the Portland State University Faculty Senate on May 8, 1995, by unanimous voice vote:

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The Faculty Senate of Oregon State University supports Governor Kitzhaber's decision to veto the School (K-12) Funding Bill. It is hoped that this action by the Governor will force the Oregon Legislative leadership to reconsider the funding priorities they established in their budget plan, which failed to properly support higher education and many other essential functions of the State.

The Faculty Senate recommends that the Oregon Legislature approve the higher education funding proposals put forward by the Chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The Faculty Senate strongly supports the three priorities of the Chancellor's legislative proposals:

- \$50 million for increases in faculty salaries. It is of paramount importance that faculty receive salary increases to offset the inflation which has occurred while salaries have been frozen, and that significant progress be made in correcting salary inequities.*
- Passage of the Higher Education Efficiency Act for the 21st Century, which, by reducing administrative inefficiencies, will permit each campus to direct a greater proportion of its budget to its essential missions of teaching, research, and service to the citizens of Oregon.*
- Moderate the increases in student tuition, which has increased inordinately in the past 4 years.*

The Faculty Senate also recommends that the "kicker" law be repealed and the funds used to meet the budgetary needs of higher education and other state services.

The Faculty Senate supports the Oregon Public Employees' Union in their negotiations with the State for salary increases. They, like the faculty, have seen their earnings eroded by inflation and the impending implementation of Measure 8, and deserve an increase that will make their income equitable with those in the private sector.

Sarah E. Andrews-Collier
Secretary to the Faculty

TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Annual Report -- 1994-95

Membership:

Ronald Babcock, MUS
Nancy Brawner-Jones, SPED
Thomas Chenoweth, EPFA
Mary Gordon-Brannan, SPHR
Carol Mack, CI
Jon Mandaville, HST
Ray Mariels, ENG
Jeanette Palmiter, MTH
Leonard Simpson, BIO
William Tate, TA
Suwako Watanabe, FLL
Emily Young, ART - Chairperson

Ex-officio:

Robert Everhart
Ulrich H. Hardt
Kathy Greey

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) discussed the merits of the proposed new design of Oregon licensure. It is proposed that the current two-level system (grades K-9 elementary, and grades 5-12 secondary) be changed to four levels: Early Childhood (age 3 - grade 4), Elementary (grades 3-6), Middle Level (grades 5-10), and High School (grades 9-12). These recommendations are based on the 21st Century School Act and are also the recommendations of the Oregon Joint Boards of Education. The TEC opposes the proposal as being overly specialized and allowing for less flexibility, and it sent a letter of its concerns to TSPC.

The TEC reviewed the proposed Early Intervention/Special Education endorsement program at PSU. Thirteen of the required 15 courses in the program are already being offered across the University, and there is a great need for this newly approved Oregon endorsement area. The TEC recommended that the program be forwarded to the Graduate Council and Faculty Senate for approval.

The TEC heard a report about the Professional Development Projects the School of Education has established with partner schools and school districts, collaborations on projects that are mutually beneficial to the partners involved.

Plans are underway for the following cohorts of 30 students each during 1995-96: One "Inclusion" (elementary and special education), and one secondary for Fall term; one elementary and one secondary cohort for Spring term. Applications are running approximately at 80 for each of the 30 slots. Additionally, there are cohorts of students for counseling and administrative programs, as well as groups of students for various graduate degrees.

Finally, the TEC is making plans for the 1996 accreditation visits of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and Oregon's Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

Members: Steve Brenner (F94, W95), Alan Cabelly, Jack Cooper, Ansel Johnson, Beatrice Oshika (Chair), Thomas Potiowski (Sp95), Joan Strouse

The Advisory Council met almost weekly during the academic year, with Judith Ramaley attending approximately twice a month, and other guests--Lindsay Desrochers (FADM), Michael Reardon, Rod Diman and Ray Johnson (OAA), Robert Vieira (OSA), and Deborah Murdock (Government Relations)--attending other times.

The work of the Advisory Council fell into three major areas:

- (a) review of constitutional changes:
 - reviewed language of amendments dealing with membership on faculty governance committees, in the context of the new definition for Faculty Senate membership passed by the Senate in 1993-94, and suggested no changes.
 - reviewed language of amendment that extended ex officio membership in the Senate to various 'assistant' and 'director' positions in administrative units, and suggested clearer definition of the job titles.
 - advised OAA on new definition of faculty which required 'certification' by Provost that members have academic qualifications and professional responsibilities consistent with ranked faculty qualifications and responsibilities. The Advisory Council recommended that certification be granted to those who held a graduate degree and whose central professional role was directly educational, such as instruction or research.
- (b) advising re other campus-wide issues:
 - met with President Ramaley re PSU response to passage of Measure 8, and tracked budget and legislative issues throughout this legislative session with her, Lindsay Desrochers and Debbie Murdock;
 - reviewed draft material re attitudes of faculty toward administration as part of accreditation self-study;
 - participated in meetings with Pappas Group as part of the study of delivery of student services;
 - discussed with Robert Vieira, Ray Johnson and Richard Toscan, chair of the Dean of Students Search Committee, the re-focusing of the search toward an enrollment management emphasis at possible expense of student affairs;
 - supported ad hoc committee recommendation to initiate move to Division I/Big Sky conference;
 - discussed with Michael Reardon issues curricular issues associated with a liberal arts and sciences education, the notion of general education requirements, and the content and focus of BA vs BS degrees;
 - submitted names to President Ramaley for the positions of Advisor to the President and Secretary to the Faculty.
- (c) policy issues referred by Senate Steering Committee
 - reviewed process and content underlying revised P&T guidelines being developed by the School of Education, and concluded that appropriate process was followed and that representation of faculty reflected in current guidelines was maintained in proposed revised guidelines.
 - report from 1993-94 Advisory Council re fixed-term faculty will be submitted by Larry Bowlden, Chair during that year.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Annual Report -- 1994 - 1995

Membership:

Carol Franks (ENG - CLAS)
Gina Greco (FLL - CLAS)
Suwako Watanabe (FLL - CLAS)
Robert Tinnin (BIO - CLAS)
William Abrams (LIB)
Nancy Goldman (XS)
Trevor Smith (CE - EAS)
Donald Watne (SBA)
Walton Fosque (ART)
David Krug (ED)
George Lendaris (SySc - AO)
Ansel Johnson, chair (GEOL-CLAS)

The Committee on Committees is charged to make appointments for Constitutional Committees and make recommendations for Administrative Committees.

Fall Term, the committee made recommendations and appointments for the Calendar Year Committees.

Winter Term, the Committee met to make recommendations and appointments which needed to be done to fill positions vacated by resignation. The committee continues to discuss the value of service on University Committees, and appreciates the current efforts at revising the P&T guidelines to include Service as a major consideration of Faculty Scholarship.

Spring Term, the committee will make the recommendations and appointments for the Academic Year Appointments. The committee is currently awaiting the results of the Faculty response to the committee preference survey. Appointments will be made or recommended by the end of May, or early in June.

May 17, 1995

To: Faculty Senate
From: University Planning Council
(Beatrice Oshika, Chair)
Subj: Review of School of Education proposed P&T Guidelines

As directed by the Senate Steering Committee, the University Planning Council has reviewed the proposed revisions in P&T Guidelines from the School of Education. The revisions move the department-based P&T procedures to school-wide procedures, with elected representation from departments on the school-wide P&T Committee. Details are described in a Revised Draft: School of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines dated May 1, 1995. Earlier versions of the document were reviewed and discussed by School of Education faculty and by UPC and Advisory Council, and their comments are reflected in the May 1, 1995 version.

In addition to reviewing the document, UPC and Advisory Council solicited comments from School of Education faculty with the guarantee of anonymity. One comment and one inquiry were received. The comment dealt with the appropriateness of fixed-term faculty as voting members and with the use of 'open' (as opposed to confidential) letters from outside reviewers possibly biasing comments toward being uniformly favorable. The inquiry had to do with how anonymity was guaranteed. It was determined that the issues raised in the comment should be addressed by the School of Education itself and not by a university committee, as long as P&T procedure and practice were consistent with university procedure.

Two faculty from the School of Education who served on the committee that developed the revised guidelines, Emily de la Cruz and Ulrich Hardt, attended a UPC meeting and answered questions re the process of developing the guidelines and comparison between current and proposed procedures. William Greenfield, a UPC member from Education, also served as a resource.

After this extensive review, the conclusion of UPC is that the two central issues associated with revision of P&T guidelines were satisfactorily addressed by the School of Education:

- a) Appropriate process was followed: there was faculty input into the document during its development, and opportunity for faculty to raise questions either internally to the School of Education or externally to faculty governance committees.
- b) Faculty representation was maintained: election to the school-wide committee from the departments appears to preserve representation of faculty across ranks and the ability of fixed-term faculty to vote for (but not serve as) departmental representatives on the committee. In general, the P&T procedures from the three departments within the School of Education were merged, and where there were differences, the broader and more inclusive choice was made.

It should be noted that the May 1, 1995 document was voted on by Education faculty in a secret ballot. The results were not known at the time this report was written.

May 17, 1995

E7-b

To: Faculty Senate
From: Advisory Council
(Beatrice Oshika, Chair)
Subj: Review of School of Education proposed P&T Guidelines

As directed by the Senate Steering Committee, the Advisory Council has reviewed the proposed revisions in P&T Guidelines from the School of Education. The revisions move P&T procedures from the department to a school-wide level, with elected representation from departments on the school-wide P&T Committee. Details are described in a Revised Draft: School of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines dated May 1, 1995. Earlier versions of the document were reviewed and discussed by School of Education faculty and by the Advisory Council and University Planning Council, and their comments are reflected in the May 1, 1995 version.

In addition to reviewing the document, Advisory Council and UPC solicited comments from School of Education faculty with the guarantee of anonymity. One comment and one inquiry were received, and are described in Attachment E7-a, the report from UPC on this issue. It was determined that the issues raised should be addressed within the School of Education and not by a university committee, as long as P&T procedure and practice were consistent with university procedure.

Joan Strouse, an Advisory Council member who is from the School of Education, served as a resource to discuss the process of development of the revised guidelines and the comparison with current procedures. Two other members of the Advisory Council serve on UPC which was also doing a review of the proposed guidelines, and shared the discussion from that group, including a meeting with two Education faculty members who served on the committee that developed the guidelines.

After this review, the conclusion of the Advisory Council is that the two central issues associated with revision of P&T guidelines were satisfactorily addressed by the School of Education:

- a) Appropriate process was followed: faculty participated in development of the guidelines through several iterations, including a straw vote on basic issues, and had the opportunity to raise questions both within the School of Education and externally to faculty governance committees.
- b) Faculty representation was maintained: in general, the P&T procedures from the three departments were merged and where there were differences, the more inclusive choice was made. Election to the school-wide committee from the departments appears to preserve representation of faculty across ranks and the ability of fixed-term faculty to vote for (but not serve as) departmental representatives on the committee.

It should be noted that Education faculty voted in a secret ballot on the May 1, 1995 version of the guidelines, but results were not known at the time of this report.

It should also be noted that the Advisory Council reviewed the guidelines in the context of due process and preservation of faculty representation, and is making no judgment with respect to the merits of department-based P&T procedures as compared with school-wide procedures.

May 17, 1995

To: Faculty Senate
From: University Planning Council
(Beatrice Oshika, Chair)
Subj: Quarterly Status Report (April-June)

During this quarter UPC dealt with three major issues:

(a) Scheduling implications of 3-->4 credit conversion

- met with Sue Hanset and William Spurling of Facilities to clarify the status of the current databases on classroom space;
- submitted list of attributes to Facilities to be added to a central database on classroom and other campus space, and to be used in classroom allocation when planned automated tools for scheduling become available;

(b) Guidelines for implementation of 3-->4 credit conversion

- reviewed the draft guidelines of the Curriculum Committee for interim protocols for course and program changes that result from the 3--4 credit conversion. There are concerns about the 'no net increase in credit' provisos, and the balance of curricular control between departments and the Curriculum Committee. UPC agrees that the intent should be to contain the growth of credits and courses not offered regularly, but believes flexibility and central responsibility by departmental curricular recommendations should be maintained.
- worked on draft guidelines re other aspects of the conversion, including suggestions for scheduling.

(c) Review of revised School of Education P&T Guidelines

- reviewed versions of the draft revisions and determined that due process, with extensive faculty involvement, was followed, and that faculty representation was preserved in the revised procedures.

TO: The Faculty Senate
FR: The University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

May 19, 1995

F3

Here follows, for Senate discussion, a memorandum originally sent to Chairs and Deans on May 3. It contains the UCC's proposed interim protocols for 4-credit conversion. If you wish to communicate suggestions or reactions prior to the June 5 Senate meeting, please e-mail them to the UCC Chair, David Holloway (david@nh1.nh.pdx.edu).

TO: PSU Departments, Schools, and Colleges
FR: University Curriculum Committee
RE: **Interim Protocols for 4-credit conversion.**

May 3, 1995

At the February 6, 1995 meeting of the Faculty Senate, a motion was passed approving the 4-credit conversion to take effect Fall 1996 and, among other things, stating that the "University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee will establish protocols for the implementation and approval to proceed during 1995-96. The above committees will provide interim recommendations at the April 1995 Senate Meeting."

Since that time the UCC has met on a weekly basis (and its Chair has met with CLAS department chairs and regularly with the University Planning Council). The UCC has identified the extremely tight calendar in effect if the 4-credit conversion is to take place in Fall 1996. In particular, program and course changes need to arrive at OAA by June 15, 1995. If proposals meet this deadline, changes will likely be reflected in the Fall 1996 Time Schedule and the 1996-97 Bulletin (i.e., the PSU Catalogue).

Attached are the draft interim protocols which the UCC is recommending to the Faculty Senate. The UCC has limited its recommendations to the substance and form of course/program changes since the UPC and other committees are dealing with matters such as scheduling, classroom availability, and contracts.

In order to effect the conversion by Fall 1996, the protocols must be sent to departments as soon as possible. The UCC will continue to coordinate its work with UPC and OAA, and to address protocol issues as they arise. However, we anticipate that significant coordination among departments will also be necessary, particularly for service courses and cross-unit issues.

Finally, we note that no assessment of the implementation or effectiveness of the English Department's "pilot program" has been done, but we have discussed their anecdotal evidence and have tried to address the concerns that department has identified with the conversion. We have reviewed the protocols adopted by the University of Oregon for their 4-credit conversion and have attempted to achieve some degree of consistency with those guidelines.

Interim Protocols for 4-Credit Conversion: Course and Program Changes

The following are the interim protocols for 4-credit conversion of courses under the 4-credit course model adopted by the University. In developing these protocols, the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has addressed two principal issues: the general curricular guidelines for changing courses from 3 to 4 credits, and the format that documentation for those courses should take.

In preparing these protocols, the UCC has noted and concurred with the statement in the University Planning Council's memorandum to the Faculty Senate of 11 December 1994: the committee respects the autonomy of departments and disciplines in structuring their curricula, and wants to ensure that program requirements drive the assignment of course credit, such that there is flexibility within the notion of "typical" course credit."

The 4-credit conversion provides an opportunity for departments to completely re-evaluate their programs and courses, and in particular to eliminate from the Bulletin courses which are no longer offered on a regular basis (such "phantom" courses prove particularly troublesome to students planning their academic programs). We urge departments to engage in such evaluation as they consider course conversions and to be realistic about their expectations and abilities to offer courses on a regular basis.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR CONVERSIONS: A principal goal of these protocols is to insure Bulletin integrity. That is, the Bulletin should accurately reflect what courses each department is offering on a consistent basis, with sufficient description of courses and programs to provide students with the information they need to plan their academic programs.

To achieve this, the following general guidelines should be followed:

1. **Purpose of Credits.** Course credit should be assigned on the basis of 1 credit for 3 hours of work per week (work is educational activity, including class attendance, that a typical student needs to do to satisfactorily complete the course).
2. **Credits per Contact Hours.** Absent additional information from a department, the UCC will assume that for lower division courses, (1) 1 credit will be given for each scheduled hour of lecture, recitation, discussion, seminar or other faculty contact hour; and (2) 1 credit will be given for every 3 scheduled laboratory hours per week with little or no work required outside the formal hours scheduled for the laboratory. This credit formulation will be less applicable to upper division courses where advanced students may be expected to complete more hours of work outside of scheduled class hours.
3. **400/500 Courses.** If a department wants to convert a 400/500 course to 4 credits, the UCC expects both the graduate and undergraduate course to become 4 credits. Of course, a department may always choose to keep a course at 3 credits. And any course change proposal for a 400/500 course will have to be approved by both the UCC and the Graduate Council.
4. **Interdependence.** Each department should pay careful attention to cross-unit issues (dependence on course in other departments) and should check with every relevant department to ensure that the impacted courses will continue to be offered after conversion.
5. **Accreditation Requirements.** Departments and schools/colleges should give rigorous review of proposed changes to ensure that accreditation needs are met, that cross-unit issues are addressed, and that course changes are consistent with programs, majors, minors, and certificates.
6. **No Net Credit Increases for Programs.** Changes to 4-credit should not result in any net increase in credits required for a major, minor, or credit program.
7. **No Net Credit Increases for the Catalogue.** Departments should provide specific justification for any net increases in the total number of credits offered by the department as listed in the catalogue. The 4-credit conversion should result in fewer courses overall, and fewer courses offered per term. All courses listed in the catalogue must be offered on a regular basis. The UCC recognizes that departments that must offer a large number of service courses (e.g., languages, math) may need special accommodation to meet this guideline.

Because the 4-credit conversion is not mandatory, some departments may convert only a few courses, or may convert courses gradually over a number of years. To ensure Bulletin integrity in cases of partial or gradual conversion, the UCC will require that any new course proposed, and any increase in credit hours for existing courses, be matched by an equal reduction in credits or a specific justification based on new faculty.

DOCUMENTATION of CONVERSIONS:

A: Particular course and program changes: In order to avoid duplication of effort, the UCC tries to use for its review purposes the same documentation which the OAA requires from departments. To our knowledge, OAA is not planning any modification of its forms for new courses or course changes. Hence, the documentation required of departments by the UCC in the 4-credit conversion will consist of the forms submitted to OAA for course changes and for new courses.

However, for batches of similar course changes, OAA and hence the UCC will consider combinations of courses listed together using the form for "Proposal for Change in Existing Course." Substantially transformed or newly designed courses should continue to use the forms for "Proposal for a New Course." Changes in major/minor requirements, etc., should use the "Change in Existing Program" forms.

B. Overview of Department-wide Conversion from 3 to 4 Credits: In addition to separate forms, departments are expected to provide an overall cover summary of changes, including the following:

- 1. Net Credits Summary.** For departments which are effecting 4-credit conversion for all or the majority of their courses, a listing of total credits added and dropped, with a statement of net loss or gain in credits.
- 2. Net Credits Explanation.** For any net gain in total credits in any department, a statement justifying that net gain, even if only one course is changed. (We are concerned about maintaining Bulletin integrity in the event of partial and gradual changes; we urge departments, schools, and colleges to pay particular attention to this.)
- 3. Cross-Listing and Interdependence Statement(s).** When any department cross-lists a new or changed course, or has a major, minor, or certificate or other program which is dependent on a course offering in another department, a statement from the "outside" department(s) that the cross-listed or dependent course will continue to be offered on a regular basis.

The overall summary should take the following form:

Proposal for Department-wide Conversion from 3 to 4 Credits					
1. Net credits Summary :					
Course Number	Course Title	Credit Increase	Credit Decrease	No change	
Net credit balance \pm _____ hrs					
2. Net Credits Explanation:					
3. Cross-Listing Statement(s):					

IFS REPORT, SCOTT BURNS, MAY 1, 1995

This is a report of the April meeting of the IFS in Salem. Most of the meeting dealt with preparing comments on the new diversity initiative that the Board had asked IFS for input. A statement resulted that said that IFS was in principle in favor of the whole initiative but had concerns. We were concerned about potential faculty salary compression on campuses where it would most be used and also where the funding for the program was going to come from, especially now that it appears that it might come from existing programs. We felt that it did not address enough the whole idea of retention after people had been recruited to the campuses. We emphasized that each campus should develop their own plan because of the different needs of the campuses.

Two points of information of interest to the PSU faculty senate were gleaned from reports from the board meetings and the academic council meetings. The climate in the chancellor's office for placing a faculty member on the board seems to be much more favorable than in the past. This is one of the aims of IFS, and we continue to work on this. The University of Oregon is discussing what constitutes a part time student right now - is the limit 7 or 8 hours before tuition jumps. This will become significant when both U of O and PSU convert over to mainly four hour classes and two classes will be 8 hours.

A legislative update from consultants, legislators and IFS members who had made testimonies in Salem was both encouraging and discouraging. It appears that the Educational Efficiency Act and the OHSU bill will probably pass as they both are out of committee and passed out with unanimous votes. Person after person said that we were being well represented in Salem by the Chancellor's office staff, the Chancellor, higher education lobbyists, our presidents, and the faculty and administrators who gave testimonies to the legislature. Our problem is that we have no real advocates for higher education in the leadership positions in the legislature. Productivity of faculty still keeps coming up - after hours of well-presented testimonies, we still keep getting questions like you don't work many hours a week. It is frustrating when faculty morale on campuses is so low.

Next IFS meeting is in LaGrande on June 2-3.

LD 4349

A192

F25

ES

Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

May 8, 1995

To: Faculty Senate

From: Steve Bleiler-MTH, Chair- Faculty Development Committee *SB*

Re: Semi-annual report of the FDC

Committee members: George Cabello-FFL, Ken Dueker-UPA, Kit Dusky-LIB, Walt Fosque-SFPA, Gerald Guthrie-PSY, Gene Hakanson-CAPS, Joseph Kaplan-SPED, Valerie Katgiri-CEED, Joanne Klebba-SBA, Gerardo Laffierre- MTH, Thomas Potiowsky-ECON, Shelly Reece-ENG, Barbara Sestak-SFPA, W. Herman Taylor-BIO, Paul Van Halen-EE, Norm Wyers-SSW

Consultants: Michael Reardon-OAA, Roy Koch-OAA

Report: The Faculty Development Committee recently awarded \$100,000 in funding through the Faculty Development Program. Funding was provided to some 31 separate proposals, 14 of which were funded fully. As in the past, requests totaled nearly three times the available resources, so many fine proposals could only be awarded limited funding. The complete list of funded proposals will appear in PSU Currently. The Committee has also completed its recommendations for funding under the Institutional Career Support-Peer Review program and has sent these recommendations on to the Provost for final action.

The Committee wishes to take this opportunity to thank Marge Enneking and the staff of the Office and Research and Sponsored Projects for their valuable assistance with the administration of the Faculty Development Program.

There is now in place a Faculty Development "cycle" of submission, evaluation, execution, and assessment of projects and within this cycle, the Faculty Development Program will continue next year essentially without change. Details are available in the Program Announcement. Proposals must be received in the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects by Nov. 17, 1995 and the committee intends to announce program awards in mid-April 1996. The Program Announcement will be distributed to all Faculty at the close of the Spring 1995 term and will be available from the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

Principal investigators of projects funded under the 94-95 program are reminded that the report to the committee on the outcomes of their project is due in the Office of Research and Sponsored projects no later than Sept. 30, 1995.

Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

May 31, 1995

Dear Colleague:

The Faculty Development Committee is pleased to announce another internal grant program for Portland State University faculty. This Faculty Development Program provides a single opportunity to apply for the many forms of internal support. Faculty holding an appointment of 0.5 FTE or more, and whose appointment continues throughout the 1995-96 academic year, are eligible to apply to this Program.

Statement of Purpose

In response to the current budget climate, the primary purpose of this year's program is to aid in building our capacity for research, instruction, and service through the enlargement of the university's resource base. Priority will be given to proposals that have as their major purpose the development of subsequent proposals for external funding. In projects where outside funding is not logically required, an explanation is to be included (per the Proposal preparation section below). Investigators are encouraged to contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 105-C Neuberger Hall, for help in identifying funding agencies and programs, both public and private.

The Committee will support a broad range of scholarly activities, from discovery to interpretation, including but not limited to activities which

- 1) promote the discovery, integration, or application of knowledge
- 2) develop community partnerships or have a significant professional or community service component
- 3) promote effective teaching and/or innovative curricular development
- 4) are of an interdisciplinary nature and/or have the involvement of multiple faculty
- 5) are in keeping with the major general initiatives in the areas of health, the environment, international affairs, educational reform, information technology, and organizational effectiveness, and/or
- 6) have a significant impact on the professional development of the faculty members involved.

The Committee emphasizes that the above list is not a ranking of priorities and is by no means exclusive.

Budget Justification

The body of the proposal must contain a **separate, clearly labeled** section justifying the budget request. This justification must be presented in a manner appropriate for a well-informed reader evaluate the proposed use of funds. **The rationale for each budget item must be specified.** In particular, principal investigators requesting items of equipment costing \$500.00 or more must indicate the manufacturer and model number, and must clearly explain the need for the particular model. Similarly, the activities and role of research assistants **must be detailed and clearly justified** within this section.

The Committee intends to fund a broad range of items. However, purchases of computer hardware will not, in general, be funded. Funds for released time can only be awarded in exceptional circumstances. The normal replacement cost per credit hour of a lower division course is \$451 plus OPE. If an investigator is requesting released time at a higher replacement rate, that rate must be explicitly justified within the proposal. Funding for the following items cannot be approved. **Proposals that include these items will be rejected by the Committee without review:**

- * in-state travel (per OSSHE policy)
- * released time that results in the complete release from teaching in a given quarter
- * activities to be performed in fulfillment of degree requirements of the principal investigator.

Proposal Preparation

Proposals must meet the page and vita format requirements listed below. In addition to the budget justification section, all proposals are to include an abstract of no more than 200 words suitable for media release. **Proposals not meeting these requirements will be rejected by the Committee without review.**

Proposal format:

Cover sheet	1 page, per the attached
Proposal	a maximum of 5 single space typewritten pages, in at least 10 point type (12 spaces/inch).
Budget	1-2 pages in the attached format
External funding	List agencies identified/targeted or include a statement as to why external funding is inappropriate to project
Vita summaries	a maximum of 2 pages per participant

Investigators are to submit **ten** copies of their proposal to the Office of Research and Sponsored projects, 105 Neuberger Hall, by **5:00 p.m. Friday, November 17, 1995**. Proposals concerning human subjects, live animals, recombinant DNA, or radioactive materials must have the approval of the appropriate persons/committees. The Committee reminds principal investigators that various academic units may have earlier deadlines for review and commentary. Principal investigators are to contact their Deans, Directors and/or Department Chairs regarding each unit's deadline.

Evaluation

The Committee receives more proposals than it can fund. The Committee will judge applications on the basis of the scholarly or creative merit of the project, and on the ability of the applicant(s) to successfully complete the proposed project. Budgets will be evaluated on the basis of their appropriateness to the project's objectives and anticipated results. The Committee will also consider the history, nature, and sufficiency of past and present funding received by the applicant(s).

All proposals will be evaluated by reviewers reading within and across subject areas. Proposals will typically receive four to six reviews. The Committee reserves the right to solicit reviews from outside the Committee and/or the University. Investigators are reminded that many reviewers do not support proposals that are overly technical or rely on an excessive use of disciplinary jargon.

Reporting

Investigators funded under this program are expected to file a final report with the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects by September 30, 1997. The report should include a copy of the extramural proposal, any intent to publish or exhibit results, and an abstract of no more than 200 words suitable for media release. The body of the report should be no more than three pages in length, with the extramural proposal included as an appendix. **Investigators failing to provide final reports will be ineligible to receive further funding from the Faculty Development Committee until a report acceptable to the Committee has been received.** Proper acknowledgement of Faculty Development Awards is to appear in articles and papers.